

Appl. No. : 09/803,329  
 Filed : March 9, 2001

## SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW

The Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courteous interview conducted on December 8, 2005. At the interview, no exhibits were shown, nor were demonstrations conducted. The claims in general were discussed, but, in particular Claims 1, 8 and 9 were mentioned. While the prior art in general was discussed, no specific prior art reference was discussed. It was proposed that the limitations in Claims 8 or 9 might form the basis for a patentable claim. It was also discussed that the "whereby" clause in Claim 1 recited a result that did not necessarily lend patentable weight.

The principle arguments presented at the interview related to the nature of the invention and an appropriate manner for claiming it. The Applicants explained that the invention relied on determining the number of different images that were necessary to create an acceptable probability that the average consumer would not see the same image repeated over a selected period of time. The Examiner agreed that such an invention was not disclosed in the prior art of which he was aware, but, explained that a more definite manner of claiming the invention was required. The Examiner agreed to consider the present Amendment, which has been prepared in accordance with the discussion at the interview.

The Examiner requested that the Applicant voluntarily disclose prior to a formal Rule 105 request whether any prior sales of packages produced in accordance with the claimed invention had occurred. For the record, no such sales have ever occurred in the United States.

Appl. No. : 09/803,329  
 Filed : March 9, 2001

# REMARKS


Claim 1 has been amended, such that all of the presently pending claims incorporate the ideas formerly recited in Claims 8 and 9 so as to more clearly recite the novel features of the invention. The newly recited features have been taken directly from the specification, in particular from pages 6 and 10-11. As such, the claims are now consistent with the specification and withdrawal of the rejection under Section 112 is respectfully requested. Moreover, nothing in the prior art cited by the Examiner would appear to suggest these features. As such, withdrawal of the rejection over the prior art is also respectfully requested.

Please charge any fees, including any fees for extension of time, to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 16 Jan. 2006

By:   
 Daniel E. Altman  
 Registration No. 34,115  
 Attorney of Record  
 Customer No. 20,995  
 (949) 760-0404

2292522  
 011606